



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

avow our persuasion that no writer of the New Testament has interpreted the Old Testament allegorically, except the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, a composition not produced by St. Paul, nor in any sense authoritative.

For the study of Christian men Dr. Noyes has opened a door to a genuine knowledge of the Old Testament Scriptures, and intelligent Christian ministers may well be grateful that so much of the Bible, in English words with a meaning and the true meaning, has been placed within their reach.

Since the preceding words were written, the grave has closed over what was mortal of the excellent man whose labors in one department of Biblical interpretation were so useful and important. His last hours of consciousness were given to the correction of sheets of a revised translation of the New Testament, which had employed his leisure in recent years. This posthumous work will doubtless be the worthy completion of the studies of a well-spent life, and a monument to the learning, the industry, and the piety of one of the most conscientious and thorough of American scholars.

5. — *Origin and History of the Books of the Bible, both the Canonical and the Apocryphal, designed to show what the Bible is not, what it is, and how to use it. (The New Testament.) Illustrated.* By Professor C. E. STOWE, D.D. Published by subscription only, by Hartford Publishing Company, Hartford, Conn. 1867. 8vo. pp. 583.

THE main purpose of this volume is to present in a popular form the principal facts relating to the origin and early history of the books of the New Testament. There can be no question as to the existence of much ignorance, both among Christian believers and those who reject Christianity, in respect to many of the subjects here treated. Even among liberally educated laymen, how many have given any attention to the critical study of the books of the New Testament, — books which, on any hypothesis as to the truth of Christianity, should certainly be regarded as objects of the greatest curiosity and interest? How many have any intelligent acquaintance with the history of the collection, and the character of the evidence for the genuineness of the different portions of it, or could even name the books which Eusebius, in the fourth century, mentions as still in dispute, in distinction from

those universally received at that time in the churches? Matters pertaining to the history and interpretation of these writings seem to be left to clergymen and professors of theology, of whom it may be said, without disrespect, that a large majority are placed under influences far from favorable to unprejudiced judgment and freedom of inquiry. The opinion at the same time widely prevails, that the genuineness and infallibility of each of these books, to say nothing of those of the Old Testament, is a fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith. They are identified with the Christian revelation itself. There has therefore been, on the part of many of those to whom the community look for religious instruction, a tendency, conscious or unconscious, to keep out of sight those facts concerning the character of these books, and concerning the history of some of them, which might lead to doubts of the traditionary belief. The ignorance and misapprehension which have hence resulted have left the faith of multitudes an easy prey to the assaults of scepticism. They have not rested their belief in the Divine origin of Christianity on its immovable foundation in unquestionable facts of history, and in the nature of man, but on the rubbish which later ages have piled around the original structure, to be swept away by the first flood of free inquiry. Among those who assail Christianity in popular writings of very wide circulation, we often find, likewise, the grossest ignorance in regard to such subjects as the "various readings" of the text of the New Testament (the great number of which is supposed to render it wholly uncertain), the Apocryphal Gospels, and the history of the Canon. It may be worth while to give a single example. We are gravely told, in a ponderous volume of eight hundred pages, which, in eight years, appears to have gone through no less than twelve editions, that "in the year 325, at the command of Constantine, two thousand and forty-eight bishops assembled at Nice." On account of their quarrels, "Constantine was obliged to disqualify seventeen hundred and thirty from having any voice in deciding which books were and which were not the word of God, and only three hundred and eighteen were left. These decided that the books of the Bible, as subsequently known, were the word of God. . . . Out of fifty Gospels then extant, they decided that those of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were worthy of being preserved, while they rejected entirely the books of James, Jude, and the Apocalypse. After this decision, Constantine arose and solemnly declared that the same should be considered as sanctioned by the Divine will; and that the books thus fixed upon should thereafter be implicitly believed as the word of God. Those manuscripts that were rejected (among which were three well-

written Gospels) were committed to the flames.”* This is a specimen of the stuff received as history by large masses of innocent people.

There can be no doubt, then, of the need of such information as Dr. Stowe professes to give. How he has met the want is another question. The first chapter, “What the Bible is not, what it is, and how to use it,” if not to be highly commended, yet contains much which is fitted to give a more correct view of the subject than is usually presented in popular books. The author does not adopt the theory of verbal inspiration, or, to express it in his classical Latin, “the exact *verbum verbo* dictation by the Holy Spirit in the composition of the Scriptures,” and is “quite ready to believe that Moses knew nothing at all of the science of geology.” The third chapter, on the text of the New Testament, gives, among other things, an interesting account of the five oldest manuscripts that have come down to us, and illustrates the subject by nine fac-similes. Though it contains a considerable number of errors, and no notice is taken in it of two very important aids in establishing the text of the Greek Testament, namely, the ancient versions, and the quotations in early ecclesiastical writers, it is on the whole well adapted to its purpose. The next chapter gives brief biographical sketches of the writers who are to be brought forward as witnesses to the reception of the different books. Their testimony to each book is then exhibited, preceded by a short introduction; and the character of the later Apocryphal writings, as contrasted with that of the Gospels and other books of the New Testament, is illustrated by very copious analyses and extracts, which constitute perhaps the most useful part of the work. “Modern substitutes for the Gospel history” are examined, in a brief review of the theories of Strauss, Weisse, Gfroerer, Bruno Bauer, F. C. Baur, Renan, and Schenkel, in a style not adapted to convince unbelievers; the “Bible Prophecies and the Classical Oracles” are contrasted; and the volume ends with a chapter on “The Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament, and the Reasons for their Exclusion from the Canon.”

The book is written in a plain, colloquial style, enlivened with familiar illustrations; but of the scholarship displayed in it, and the manner in which the main subject is treated, we cannot speak with praise. It is often superficial, uncritical, and untrustworthy; abounding in loose reasonings and inaccurate statements. In speaking, for example, of the various readings of manuscripts of the Greek Testament, it is broadly asserted that “not fifty of the fifty thousand make any change in the

* “The Principles of Nature, her Divine Revelations,” &c., by Andrew Jackson Davis, 12th ed., 1855, pp. 555.

meaning whatever," and that "most of them are simple differences of orthography" (p. 81). What is true is, that but a very small number are of any importance. Again we have the unqualified statement that in John i. 18, "the old Greek manuscripts read, *The only begotten God who is in the bosom of the Father*" (p. 79), the fact being that this remarkable reading is found in only *five* Greek manuscripts in all, including indeed two whose date is assigned to the middle of the fourth century, while the common reading is contained in at least *thirteen* uncial manuscripts, including the Alexandrine of the fifth century. It is a still more careless assertion, that in Colossians ii. 2, "the old Greek manuscripts read, *To the acknowledgment of the mystery of the God Christ*"; the fact being that the reading which Professor Stowe incorrectly translates in this manner is found in but *one* Greek manuscript, and has no support from any ancient version, or the quotations of the Greek fathers. There is strong evidence for the genuineness of most of the books of the New Testament; but what are we to think of the declaration that "the testimony on which the genuineness of the sacred books of the New Testament rests is as good as any human testimony whatever *on any subject*"? (p. 101.) What estimate must we form of the critical judgment and scholarship of a man who says that the "Recognitions" and the "Clementine Homilies" "probably may be the genuine works of Clement, the friend of Paul," and as to the Canons of the Apostles and the Apostolical Constitutions, merely remarks that they are "more doubtful as to their authorship"? (p. 111.) We are not surprised after this to find that, in opposition to the best modern scholars, he regards the Epistle ascribed to Barnabas as genuine, and the "Shepherd" of Hermas, or, as he usually cites it, "Pastor Hermas," as written by Hermas the companion of Paul. Respecting the Apostle John we get some information which will be new to most students of ecclesiastical history. Professor Stowe tells us that, some time after his banishment to Patmos, "he was restored to Ephesus, where he *established a theological school*, for the purpose of supplying the numerous churches with competent pastors, as they could no longer expect the continuance of miraculous qualifications. Hence he received the appellation of the *theologian* or *divine*" (p. 187). It is a pity that Suicer, in his "Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus," and Professor Sophocles, in his "Glossary of Later and Byzantine Greek," should have so mistaken the origin of the appellation *θεολόγος*, applied by the ancient fathers to the Evangelist John. But they had never heard of this theological seminary at Ephesus. Professor Stowe (p. 132) represents Papias as saying that he learned his doctrine from the Apostle John himself, referring to Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. III. 39, who quotes Papias at length

in proof of the opposite. In the biographical sketches of the "one hundred witnesses" we may charitably refer to typographical error, or a slip of the pen in translating from Kirchhofer, the account of "*Poly carp*, the celebrated philosopher of the new Platonic school," &c. (meaning Porphyry), and the statement that Ignatius was "sur-named *Theodorus*" (Theophorus). But we can hardly so explain the statement that "*Gregory of Nazianzen*," as this father is generally named throughout the book, "was born in the year 300 at *Nazianzen* in Cappadocia." In the same chapter we find among the "witnesses" Photius of the ninth century (though, probably by a misprint, the dates of his becoming archbishop, and of his death, are given as 350 and 391 respectively, instead of 850 and 891), and Œcumenius of the tenth. It is also affirmed (p. 123), that the works of Jornandes the Goth (sixth century) "contain important testimonies," that is, of course, to the books of the New Testament. If so, they have been strangely overlooked by Christian apologists.

But errors like those which have been thus far pointed out are far less serious than another fault, which is likely to disgust the intelligent inquirer, and to prejudice him against the cause which it is the object of the work to maintain. We refer to its untrustworthiness in the statement of evidence. Some examples of this must be given. Among the witnesses to the Gospel of John, Clement of Rome is adduced. He belongs to the first century, and his testimony, if we had it, would be highly important. Professor Stowe represents him (p. 193) as quoting literally a passage of considerable length from the Gospel of John. The true state of the case is this: Jerome, in the latter part of the fourth century, in his commentary on Isaiah lii. 13-15, quotes from Clement a passage (still preserved in his Letter to the Corinthians, c. 16) descriptive of the humility of Christ, and *subjoins to it*, by way of illustration, the declaration of our Lord which Professor Stowe represents Clement as quoting from John xviii. 23. Dr. Stowe, in his quotation from Clement, omits all that actually belongs to Clement, except the words "Our Lord Jesus Christ," which he connects with the words added by Jerome. There being of course no passage in Clement's writings to which this quotation could be referred, Professor Stowe adds, "Kirchhofer, p. 144." One who looks into Kirchhofer will find the facts stated as above, Kirchhofer remarking that the words in question "must be an addition by Jerome." But how many of the twenty thousand subscribers to Professor Stowe's book have access to Kirchhofer's "*Quellensammlung zur Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Canons*"?

The way in which Dr. Stowe treats the question of the authorship of

the Epistle to the Hebrews would alone be sufficient to destroy his character for fairness and accuracy. "All the ancient catalogues," he says, "of any authority assign fourteen epistles to Paul, which necessarily includes Hebrews. . . . There is certainly no decided internal evidence against the authorship of Paul, while there is very much in its favor; while of the external evidence, the testimony, it is ten to one, ninety-nine to a hundred, in favor of Paul. . . . The ancients knew no other author than Paul; if Paul were not the writer, we find nothing in them on the subject" (pp. 381, 382). As to ancient catalogues, the oldest, and the only one early enough to be of much importance in connection with the subject, the Muratorian Canon (about A. D. 170), reckons only thirteen epistles of Paul. So the catalogue of Philastrius, bishop of Brescia, about A. D. 380 (Hær. c. 88). As to internal evidence, the striking difference in style between this and the acknowledged epistles of Paul was remarked by the ancient fathers generally, as Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome, and is fully recognized by the great body of modern scholars. And the internal evidence that it is not by Paul is very far from being confined to a great difference in style. As to external evidence, we find that the epistle was *known* to Clement of Rome, in the latter part of the first century, in whose Letter to the Corinthians there are passages which so strikingly correspond with others in the Epistle to the Hebrews as to prove this. But he does not ascribe it to Paul; and the testimony of the whole Western church down to the middle of the fourth century is adverse to its Pauline origin. It was not received as Paul's by Irenæus in Gaul, Tertullian in Africa, nor by Caius, Hippolytus, Cyprian, or Novatian. Even toward the end of the fourth century we learn from Jerome and Augustine that it was not generally received by the Latin Christians. In the East, the statements of Clement of Alexandria (fl. A. D. 192), Origen (fl. A. D. 230), and Eusebius show clearly that no consistent and well-supported tradition as to its authorship had come down to them. Clement, for example, who is the earliest writer that ascribes it to Paul, says that it was originally written in Hebrew, and translated by Luke, both of which statements we know to be erroneous, the internal evidence that it is not a translation being absolutely decisive. Origen puts forward the conjecture that "the *thoughts* are those of the apostle, while the style and method are those of some one who recorded his discourses, making notes, as it were, of what had been said by his master," and adds, "If then any church receives this epistle as Paul's, let it be commended even for this; for it is not without reason that the ancient men have handed it down as Paul's. But the truth as to the writer of the epistle, God knows. Various accounts have come to us; some saying that Clement, who became bishop of Rome, wrote the epistle; others

that it was Luke, who wrote the Gospels and the Acts." Of this passage from Origen, quoted by Eusebius (Eccl. Hist. VI. 25) from his Homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews, written late in life, Professor Stowe takes no notice, though it is by far the most important one in Origen's writings in relation to the subject. He quotes from Tertullian a passage (the only one in Tertullian's works in which the Epistle to the Hebrews is cited), *omitting the introductory words*, in which Tertullian expressly ascribes the epistle to *Barnabas*, saying, apologetically, that it was "certainly better received among the churches than the Shepherd of Hermas, *illo apocrypho Pastore mæchorum*." Not only is this important statement suppressed, but Professor Stowe's readers will be likely to suppose his quotation from Tertullian to be a testimony to the Pauline authorship of the epistle, he having but a little before said that "the ancients knew no other author than Paul." One who wishes to see the contrast between an honest and candid dealing with this question, and the treatment of it by Dr. Stowe, may consult the article by Professor Thayer, his successor as Professor of Sacred Literature at Andover, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for October, 1867. The conclusion to which Professor Thayer arrives agrees with that expressed by Professor Kendrick, in his recent translation of the Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews by Dr. C. B. Moll, forming a part of Lange's great *Bibelwerk*. Professor Kendrick says: "The translator unhesitatingly concurs with Dr. Moll in the view now acquiesced in by nearly all scholars, which looks elsewhere than to the Apostle Paul for the authorship, at least as to its form, of this epistle. Without derogating in the slightest degree from the canonical authority and the intrinsic excellency of the epistle, he regards the evidence, partly external and partly internal, of its non-Pauline origin, as overwhelming and decisive." (Pref. p. iv.)

In respect to the Second Epistle of Peter, likewise, the genuineness of which has been questioned or denied by such men as Calvin, Erasmus, Grotius, Scaliger, Salmasius, Wetstein, De Wette, Neander, Credner, Reuss, Huther, and Bleek, Professor Stowe gives no tolerably correct view of the external evidence. The early witnesses which support the genuineness of most of the New Testament books are silent in regard to this. It is not quoted by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, or Cyprian. Alford, and other defenders of its genuineness, admit that there is no clear reference to it in any writer before the time of Origen; and Origen regarded its genuineness as doubtful. It is wanting in the ancient Syriac version. Eusebius mentions it among the disputed books (*Antilegomena*), and says that "it has not been handed down to us by tradition as belonging to the New Testament" (Eccl. Hist. III. 3). This statement of Eusebius, and the other facts

which have just been mentioned, Professor Stowe does not notice. He merely remarks: "Several causes contributed to render its reception in the ancient churches later than that of the First Epistle." The first which he assigns is, "that it was addressed mainly to obscure churches," and written "near the time of the Apostle's death," whereas it appears from the epistle itself that, if genuine, it presupposes the same circle of readers as the First (2 Pet. iii. 1). Professor Stowe adduces as "testimonies to Second Peter" passages from Clement of Rome, Hermas, Justin Martyr, and Theophilus, which not only do not name the epistle or quote it, but cannot with probability be regarded as even implying any knowledge of its existence. They only show a common use of certain passages of the Old Testament, or have a remote resemblance in phraseology to certain expressions in Second Peter. He quotes passages from Origen as bearing testimony to it, without noticing the fact that they are found only in the utterly unreliable Latin translation of his works by Rufinus, who added, subtracted, and altered to suit himself;* while he ignores those in which Origen speaks of the epistle as doubted, or quotes, as he does repeatedly, the First Epistle of Peter as "*the catholic epistle*." Origen does not quote Second Peter in his extant Greek works. Dr. Stowe also cites in its favor, as Origen's, the dialogue *De Recta Fide*, well known to be falsely ascribed to this father. He quotes Jerome's testimony (given under the First Epistle, not the Second) as follows: "Simon Peter wrote two epistles, which are called catholic, of which the Second is by many doubted on account of its diversity in style from the First." The words translated by Professor Stowe, "is by *many doubted*," are in the original, *a plerisque ejus esse negatur*, "is *denied to be his by most*."

Much more might be said in illustration of the untrustworthy character of the work; but it can hardly be worth while to go further. It is fortunate for Christianity that it has a different class of defenders from Dr. Stowe. What a contrast there is between this book and the able and scholarly "Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christianity," in which Professor Fisher discusses such subjects as the genuineness of the Gospel of John, Baur's view of the early Christian history and literature, and the mythical theory of Strauss! It is no excuse for the faults which we have pointed out, that Professor Stowe's book is designed for popular use. A work may be popular without being shallow and inaccurate; and, if there is to be any distinction, an author should be even more solicitous to state the exact truth, fully and fairly, when writing for those who cannot verify his statements or supply his omissions, than when addressing scholars, who have the means of doing both.

* See Lardner's Works, II. 510, ed. 1829.